

REMARKS

In response to the non-final Office Action of August 19, 2008, applicants ask that all claims be allowed in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks. Claims and 1-33 are pending, with claims 1-3 and 8 being independent. Claims 1-3, 8, and 30-33 have been amended. Support for the amendments is found in the application at least at page 8, lines 23 to page 9, line 8 and FIG. 1. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103

Among other features, amended independent claims 1, 2, and 8 recite a light-emitting element, a first transistor for determining a value of a current flowing to the light-emitting element, and a second transistor for determining a light emission or non light emission of the light-emitting element depending on a video signal input through a signal line. A gate electrode of the first transistor is connected to a second power line, and the second power line has an electric potential so that the first transistor operates in a saturation region when the second transistor is in an on-state.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-10, 12-14, 18, 22-24, 26, 27, 29-31, and 33 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0002703 (Koyama). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Koyama does not describe or suggest that a second power line has an electric potential so that a first transistor operates in a saturation region when the second transistor is in an on-state, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 2, and 8.

Koyama relates to an electroluminescent display that includes a pixel portion 101 in which pixels 104 are arranged in matrix form. See Koyama at ¶ 0106 and Fig. 1. A transistor 109 is connected to a power supply line (V_n) 110 and to a transistor 112. See Koyama at ¶ 0117 and Fig. 3. A gate electrode of the transistor 112 is connected to a power source control line 113, and either the source or the drain of the transistor 112 is connected to an electroluminescent (EL) element 111. See Koyama at ¶ 0117 and Fig. 3. During a write-in period, the transistor 112 is in an off state, and the EL element 111 does not emit light. See Koyama at ¶ 0126. At the end of

the write-in period, the power source to the transistor 112 is turned on through an external switch 117 that is connected to the power source control line 113, and the EL element 111 emits light. See Koyama at ¶ 0131.

The Office appears to equate Koyama's transistor 112 with the recited first transistor, the power source control line 113 with the recited second power line, and the transistor 109 with the recited second transistor. See Office Action at page 3. However, there is no indication that the power source control line 113 has an electric potential such that the transistor 112 operates in a saturation region when the transistor 109 is in an on-state. Instead, depending on the setting of the external switch 117, the transistor 112 switches between operating in a linear region in an on state and operating in an off region when the transistor 112 is in an off state. Although in some aspects of Koyama the transistor 112 can be kept in an on state (see Koyama at ¶ 0139), Koyama does not disclose that the transistor 112 is operating in a saturation region when the transistor 109 is in the on state.

Accordingly, Koyama does not describe or suggest that a second power line has an electric potential so that a first transistor operates in a saturation region when the second transistor is in an on-state, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 2, and 8.

For at least this reason, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 2, and 8 and their dependent claims 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12-14, 18, 22-24, 26, 27, 29-31, and 33.

Claims 5, 11, 16, 20, and 21, each of which depend from one of independent claims 1, 2, and 8, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Koyama in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,207,969 (Yamazaki). Yamazaki, which is cited as showing a light-emitting device including a depletion type transistor, does not remedy the failure of Koyama to describe or suggest the noted features of independent claims 1, 2, and 8. Accordingly, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 5, 11, 16, 20, and 21.

Claims 3, 15, 19, 25, 28, and 32 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Koyama in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0113760 (Kimura). Among other

features, amended independent claim 3 recites that a second power line has an electric potential so that a first transistor operates in a saturation region when a second transistor is in an on-state. As discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 2, and 8, Koyama does not describe or suggest this feature. Kimura, which is cited as showing a fourth transistor for forcing a light-emitting element into a non-emission state, does not remedy the failure of Koyama to describe or suggest the noted feature of amended independent claim 3. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicants request withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection of independent claim 3 and its dependent claims 15, 19, 25, 28, and 32.

Claim 17, which depends from independent claim 3, has been rejected as being unpatentable over Koyama and Kimura in view of Yamazaki. As discussed above, neither Koyama nor Kimura describes or suggests the noted feature of independent claim 3. Moreover, Yamazaki, which is cited as showing a light-emitting device including a depletion type transistor, does not remedy the failure of Koyama and Kimura to describe or suggest the noted features of independent claim 3. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 17.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Mitsuaki Osame et al.
Serial No. : 10/807,545
Filed : March 24, 2004
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-
0223001 / US7068/7143/7203

No fees are believed due at this time. Nonetheless, please apply any charges or credits to
Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 19, 2008



Meghan A. McGovern
Reg. No. 60,476

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

40529797.doc